



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,909	05/24/2000	Gabriel J. Hall	13237-2615/ MS#149405.1	4482

27488 7590 04/23/2003

MERCHANT & GOULD
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/577,909	Applicant(s) HALL ET AL.	
	Examiner David E. England	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 28 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 8, 17, 24 are objected to because of the following informalities: At the end of the limitation “”, there is a missing semicolon. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16 – 20, 22 – 24, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mantha et al. U.S. Patent No. 6163779 (hereinafter Mantha).
2. Referencing claim 10, Mantha teaches a method for automatically attaching a web page as a single file to an email note, the method comprising the steps of:
 3. determining that a user desires to attach a selected file to the email note, (e.g. col. 8, line 1 – col. 9, line 37);
 4. determining whether the selected file is a web page, (e.g. col. 8, line 1 – col. 9, line 37);
 5. in response to a determination that the selected file is a web page, determining whether the selected file includes at least one link to at least one resource file, (e.g. col. 11, line 4 – col. 12, line 56); and

Art Unit: 2143

6. in response to a determination that the selected file includes at least one link to at least one resource file, determining whether automatic attachment of the at least one resource file has been authorized, (e.g. col. 11, line 4 – col. 12, line 56 & col. 13, lines 33 - 48); and

7. in response to a determination that automatic attachment of the at least one resource file has been authorized, packaging the selected file and the at least one resource file into a single attachment file and attaching the attachment file to the email note, (e.g. col. 13, lines 33 - 48).

8. Referencing claim 12, Mantha teaches the step of determining that a user desires to attach a file to the email note comprises determining that a user has inserted the selected file into the email note, (e.g. col. 11, line 4 – col. 12, line 56 & col. 13, lines 33 - 48).

9. Referencing claim 13, Mantha teaches the step of determining that a user desires to attach a file to the email note comprises determining that a user has copied the selected file into the email note, (e.g. col. 11, line 4 – col. 12, line 56 & col. 13, lines 33 - 48).

10. Referencing claim 16, Mantha teaches the step of determining that the selected file includes at least one link to at least one resource file comprises determining whether the selected file includes a tag including the string: <link rel=FileList href=>, (e.g. col. 10, line 16 – col. 12, line 35).

11. Referencing claim 17, Mantha teaches the step of determining that the selected file includes at least one link to at least one resource file comprises determining whether the selected file includes a link tag selected from the group of:

12. ;

13. ;

Art Unit: 2143

14. ;
15. <body background=>;
16. <script src=>;
17. <bgsound src=>;
18. <embed src=>; and
19. <link rel="stylesheet">, (e.g. col. 9, line 50 – col. 12, line 35).
20. Referencing claim 18, Mantha teaches the step of determining whether automatic attachment of the at least one resource file has been authorized comprises determining the status of at least one registry key, (e.g. col. 10, line 16 – col. 12, line 47 & col. 13, lines 33 – 48).
21. Referencing claim 19, Mantha teaches the step of determining the status of at least one registry key comprises determining the status of a web page packing registry key, (e.g. col. 10, line 16 – col. 12, line 47 & col. 13, lines 33 – 48).
22. Referencing claim 20, Mantha the step of determining the status of at least one registry key comprises determining the status of an automatic packing registry key, (e.g. col. 10, line 16 – col. 12, line 47 & col. 13, lines 33 – 48).
23. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 22 – 24, 27 and 28 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2143

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. Claims 2, 11, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha (6163779) in view of Borman et al. (6226655) (hereinafter Borman).

26. As per claim 11, Mantha does not specifically teach the step of determining that a user desires to attach a file to the email note comprises determining that a user has dragged the selected file into the email note.

Borman teaches the step of determining that a user desires to attach a file to the email note comprises determining that a user has dragged the selected file into the email note, (e.g. col. 12, line 62 – col. 13, line 17).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Borman with Mantha because it would be more convenient for a user to utilize a common function, (i.e. "drag & drop"), to copy or relocate a file as apposed to typing a command to do the same function, (i.e. using a DOS prompt).

27. Claims 2 and 26 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

28. Claims 5, 6, 14, 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha (6163779) in view of Gupta et al. (6519646) (hereinafter Gupta).

29. As per claim 14, Mantha does not specifically teach the step of determining that the selected file is a web page comprises determining whether the selected file has an ".htm" extension. Gupta teaches the step of determining that the selected file is a web page comprises determining whether the selected file has an ".htm" extension, (e.g. col. 4, lines 45 – 59). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2143

invention was made to combine Gupta with Mantha because it would be more efficient for a system to know the difference between a web page file that could be a potential link to another web page or an object that is just a picture or a link to another part of the web page that does not take a user to a different web page file. This could be used to save different parts of a web page in different directories/ folders.

30. As per claim 15, Mantha does not specifically teach the step of determining that the selected file is a web page comprises determining whether the selected file has an ".html" extension. Gupta teaches the step of determining that the selected file is a web page comprises determining whether the selected file has an ".html" extension, (e.g. col. 4, lines 45 – 59). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Borman with Mantha because of similar reasons as stated above.

31. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

32. Claims 9, 21, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mantha (6163779) in view of Gabbard et al. (6205432) (hereinafter Gabbard).

33. As per claim 21, Mantha does not specifically teach the step of packing the selected file and the at least one resource file into a single attachment file comprises converting the selected file and the at least one resource file into an MHTML file. Gabbard teaches the step of packing the selected file and the at least one resource file into a single attachment file comprises converting the selected file and the at least one resource file into an MHTML file, (e.g. col. 11, line 65 – col. 13, line 17). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gabbard with Mantha because it would be more efficient for a system to utilize a common protocol such as Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions HTML, (i.e. MINE-HTML or

Art Unit: 2143

MHTML). This protocol enables the system to more efficiently send and receive graphics, audio, and video files via the Internet mail system. Furthermore, MIME was defined in 1992 by the IETF.

34. Claims 9 and 25 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

35. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

36. a. Mintz U.S. Patent No. 6250930 discloses Multi-functional communication and aggregation platform.

37. b. Hanson et al. U.S. Patent No. 6496849 discloses Electronic media for communicating information among a group of participants.

38. c. Hong et al. U.S. Patent No. 5710883 discloses Hypertext document transport mechanism for firewall-compatible distributed world-wide web publishing.

39. d. Kelley U.S. Patent No. 6078921 discloses Method and apparatus for providing a self-service file.

40. e. Davis et al. U.S. Patent No. 5937160 discloses Systems, methods and computer program products for updating hypertext documents via electronic mail.

41. f. Sutton et al. U.S. Patent No. 6539354 discloses Methods and devices for producing and using synthetic visual speech based on natural coarticulation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De *DE*
April 9, 2003


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100